



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,406	07/19/2001	Yoshihiro Sokawa	55600-8004.US00	9683
22918	7590	03/19/2004	EXAMINER	
PERKINS COIE LLP				MOSHER, MARY
P.O. BOX 2168				
MENLO PARK, CA 94026				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1648		

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/910,406	SOKAWA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D.	1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/10/03, 2/9/04.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 18-26 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 18-26 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/10/2003.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The examiner of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to examiner Mosher. **Continued Examination Under 37**

CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/9/2004 has been entered.

All previously examined claims, drawn to compositions, have been cancelled. The new claims are drawn to a method for treating hepatitis C in a human subject.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 21 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of copending Application No.10/698,927. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claims require delivery of the same interferon to the intestine in essentially the same effective amount for treatment of a viral infection, and the hepatitis C infection is an obvious embodiment of viral infection.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 22, is the intent a one-dose treatment of 10^8 - 10^{10} units, or is the intent actually units per day?

Claims 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 18 involves two steps: (1) orally administering interferon-tau at a dosage to stimulate bloodstream levels of 2'5'-oligoadenylate synthase (OAS) over the pretreatment level, and (2) continuing the administration until improvement of the subject's condition is observed. This appears straightforward enough on first reading, but the human clinical trial data presented in the specification do not show any clear

pattern relating increased OAS to improvement in the subject's condition. If the columns marked "2-5A (SERUM)" and "2-5 (PBMC)" are measurements of OAS levels, then most of the patients in Tables 3-6 show decreases in OAS or an occasional spike in OAS with no apparent relationship to the timing of improved ALT or virus load. There is no data presented for blood OAS levels for the patients shown in figures 3-7. While it appears that there was at least some improvement in condition over the course of the oral IFN-tau treatment for some patients, the specification does not teach a reproducible method to deliver an oral dosage to a human that is effective to stimulate bloodstream levels of OAS prior to observable improvement of the patient's condition. Considering the unpredictability of a desired biological response, the state of the art, and the conflicting results shown in the working examples, it is concluded that undue experimentation would be required to practice the invention as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soos et al 6,372,206. Soos suggests treating hepatitis C virus with oral interferon tau, see column 14, lines 16-22. Soos teaches formulating the interferon in tablets with slow release, see column 15, lines 32-34; although Soos does not explicitly discuss the effect of this formulation, it is conventional for slow release tablets to avoid absorption through the oral mucosa and deliver the drug in the stomach or intestines. Soos teaches combination therapy for viral disease treatment, see column 16 lines 50-56. Soos teaches that the interferon dose may vary considerable and is typically determined by the attending physician and teaches that high doses can be administered without toxic side effects because of the lesser toxicity of this interferon, see column 15, lines 40-61. Soos teaches dosages including 10^8 units per day, see column 4 lines 33-36. Soos suggests each and every element of the claimed invention, except that the amount administered must be sufficient to raise bloodstream levels of OAS. However, Soos suggests individually determining a dosage that is therapeutically effective, including a suggestion to administer 10^8 units per day. If this dosage is effective to stimulate bloodstream levels of OAS in humans (which is not apparent from applicant's working examples), then Soos teaches the effective dosage required in the claims, even if Soos does not teach that OAS stimulation occurs. Therefore the invention as a whole is seen as *prima facie* obvious, absent unexpected results.

Claims 24-26 are seen as free of the art, because the prior art does not teach or suggest measuring the blood level of 2', 5'-oligoadenylate synthetase prior to or during treatment of hepatitis C virus with oral interferon tau.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T and alternate F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on 571-272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

3/18/04

Mary Mosher
MARY E. MOSHER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800/7600